

**MINUTES OF THE  
AUBURN CITY PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING  
February 15, 2011**

The regular session of the Auburn City Planning Commission was called to order on February 15, 2011 at 6:06 p.m. by Chairman Snyder in the Council Chambers, 1225 Lincoln Way, Auburn, California.

**COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:** Snyder, Spokely, Vitas

**COMMISSIONERS ABSENT:** Worthington, Young

**STAFF PRESENT:** Will Wong, Community Development Director  
Reg Murray, Senior Planner  
Adrienne Graham, Consulting Planner  
Michael Colantuono, City Attorney

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

**II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

None

**III. PUBLIC COMMENT**

None

**IV. COMMISSION BUSINESS**

- A. SITE ACCESS DISCUSSION FOR THE BALTIMORE RAVINE SPECIFIC PLAN (BRSP) AND STUDY AREA PROJECT.** The Planning Commission will review and consider access alternatives for the Baltimore Ravine Specific Plan and Study Area Project. The Planning Commission will accept public comment relating to the access alternatives and will provide a recommendation to the Auburn City Council as to which option would be the better alternative for access into the BRSP Project.

Commissioner Vitas recused himself and left the hearing.

Chair Snyder asked City Attorney Colantuono to explain quorum rules.

City Attorney Colantuono stated the following:

You have 2 of 5 members, a quorum of the Commission is 3. When you lose a quorum, you can continue to meet as a committee of the whole and you can provide advice for the Council as a committee of the whole, but you can't take an action that's an official action of the Commission. I'm not sure that matters; the

distinction between advice and official advice is a fine one, so my advice to you would be, unless you think there's some purpose to be served by waiting for the availability of the Commission, go ahead and have your discussion by the advice of your counsel that you may, and allow them to act on it.

Chair Snyder stated that he'd like to go ahead with the agenda.

Commissioner Spokely agreed stating that there were a lot of community members present for the meeting.

The Commission decided to proceed with the review.

Chair Snyder summarized the City Council's direction to the Planning Commission, as well as the Planning Commission's review and direction to staff provided at the February 1, 2011 Commission hearing. Chair Snyder informed the public that comment about the project should be limited to access issues for the two alternatives on Auburn Folsom Road, as directed by Council, as well as the Herdal access, since the Commission expanded the scope to include the Herdal access at the hearing on February 1, 2011.

Planner Murray gave the staff report on the issue. He reviewed the three alternatives being considered and the issues relating to each alternative, including existing topography; proposed road designs; fire safety and police safety issues; area of impact for the footprint of each option; roadway profiles and street grades; right-of-way acquisition and eminent domain; intersection improvements; impacts to existing infrastructure; street lights; maintenance costs, resource issues such as biologic, cultural, and hydrologic impacts; visual and noise impacts; cost comparisons; and CEQA implications. Planner Murray concluded his report and turned the presentation over to City Attorney Colantuono to discuss right-of-way and eminent domain issues.

City Attorney Colantuono stated the following:

The effect of the Council's request for advice from the Commission is to frame this question, can the City, ought the City, approve this project on one of two hypothetical conditions. One condition is the condition that no access be taken from Herdal Drive, and the other condition is that access be taken in addition to Herdal Drive from one of these two northerly approaches near Pacific Street. So, I can organize the legal issues that you've asked me to analyze into answering those two questions.

Can the City prevent the use of Herdal Drive? And the short answer is "probably not". The reason the answer is probably not is because Herdal Drive, as it is paved today, is a public street. As a public street, the City holds it in trust for the people of the State, and must make it available to the people of the State. So that means that private property owners who can reach that street have a right to use it, unless we close it. To close a street, we have to have a noticed public hearing in which

everybody who is potentially affected by the closure can be heard, and after that hearing, we have to find, based on the substantial evidence in the record before the City Council, that there is no present or future need for the street. I think it would be difficult to make that finding given that the street is actively serving the neighborhood and that there is a substantial piece of property that has been planned by the City to take access from that street. So, free use of the existing pavement by all property owners who can make use of it is essentially a given.

The second thing that we need to be aware of is that beyond the barrier, is not only a right of way owned by the City that the City could chose to turn into a public street, there is a private easement that was granted to the owners' of the land that this project would entitle. So, whether or not the City allows the improvement of that right-of-way and accepts it into its system of streets and makes it a public street, a private street could be constructed there. And if a private street were constructed there to serve this development or to serve that land in some other way, and the property owners benefitted by that private street after making connection to the public street where the barrier now is, we could tell them how, but we couldn't tell them "no" without closing the street, and as I said, its doubtful that we could close the street. So, it is my conclusion that the City is probably without the power to prevent the use of Herdal, so that condition regarding no use of Herdal probably is not available to the City.

So then the question becomes, what would it take to make the Pacific Street access; is one of them available as a third access point? The engineers may have some skepticism about how much traffic would actually use that route given the fact that the Herdal route and the routes out towards Newcastle and Ophir are shorter and more convenient for most trips.

Let's just frame the question. Can we create that street? My thinking is "yes", we can. The way you would do it is impose a condition of approval on the project telling the applicant in order to get a final map, which is the proof you actually need to sell land to people for development, you have to produce that street. Under the Map Act, if we require a subdivider to acquire land they don't own, they have the right to make good faith effort to acquire it from a willing seller, and if they can't, then they submit a final map to the City and that starts a 120-day clock for the City to do one of two things: 1) to exercise its power of eminent domain, at the developer's expense, to take the necessary land; or 2) waive the condition. Failing to act within 120 days accomplishes the waiver.

Eminent domain can be exercised by a four-fifths vote of the City Council, and we could take all of the rights that would be needed. We would need rights from the park district. When one government agency uses the power of eminent domain against another, we have to show that our use of the land is a higher and better public purpose than the use that it would otherwise be put to. Normally, you cannot make that showing with respect to park land; there is a rebuttable presumption that parkland is the highest and best use of the land. The reason for that is, if you've ever been to San Francisco or Los Angeles, you'll see the unfortunate decisions we

made to push freeways through parks. We did that because park land was effectively free. It became a magnet for freeways and other improvements. Recognizing that wasn't in the best interest of California, the Legislature said parkland is presumably the best use.

I think we can overcome that presumption in this case because, basically, it's wasteland. It's a tiny little finger of land that the park district is not making very good use of, and can't make very good use of, so on these facts we could take land for them. I have not done the research to confirm that we would have to replace that land inch for inch, but I think we would assume that we would, because generally when you take park land, you have to replace it. You have to replace it with the same quality of the land that you'd be taking, so I'm not sure that would necessarily be all that expensive, but we could take it if there were four votes on the Council to do so, but we would likely have to look closer.

We could require an easement from the railroad, over its objections. I doubt that would be necessary. They have standard terms; if you meet their terms, they'll give you the rights that you need.

Then lastly, we could use the power of eminent domain against the Sipe family. The Sipe family has made it quite clear that they would not go quietly into the night on this issue. The things that you have to show when you apply eminent domain to anyone, is these three things: 1) the public interest and necessity require the project; 2) the project is planned and located in a manner that will be the most compatible with the greatest public good and the least private injury; and 3) the property sought to be acquired is necessary for the project.

There was a time whenever a Legislative body, by a four-fifths vote, made those findings, the Court didn't look behind them. The Court viewed the exercise for the power of eminent domain as uniquely suited for the political branches to do, and Courts didn't second guess them. In the current day and age, where we have more skepticism of government, Courts are willing to second guess those judgments. Without them, we would have arguments about the necessity and utility of this road, particularly in light of the fact that access across Herdal would still be available. But in my judgment, we could probably prevail in most ways.

So, to make a somewhat long story short, in my judgment we probably cannot forbid cars to use Herdal and we probably could acquire the rights necessary to build the Pacific Street access, if we chose. Unless there are questions, that's all I have to say.

Chair Snyder asked if there were any questions of the City Attorney.

Chair Snyder asked if there were any other questions of staff.

Commissioner Spokely asked if additional right-of-way would need to be acquired along Auburn Folsom Road to accommodate the intersection improvements required for Alternatives 4 or 5?

City Engineer Warren responded that the issue hasn't been researched, but the right-of-way along Auburn Folsom Road meanders somewhat, so it is possible that additional right-of-way would need to be acquired from UPRR for either alternative.

Chair Snyder commented that it appeared that Alternative 4 would appear more difficult than Alternative 5 due to the bridge structure.

Commissioner Spokely asked for confirmation that the bridge length for Alternative 4 was 250 feet.

Planner Murray confirmed that the bridge length was 250 feet.

Commissioner Spokely referred to the site context photos prepared for Alternatives 4 and 5, and stated that they do a good job illustrating the fill and bridges necessary to get over the rail line.

Planner Murray noted that the photos were posted on the City website.

Commissioner Spokely noted in the February 1, 2011 hearing that there may be issues with the road designs in the UPRR right-of-way, and asked if there had been any communication with UPRR related to Alternatives 4 or 5.

Planner Murray stated that UPRR has not been approached to comment on the two new alternatives, but that the City is aware that UPRR generally likes the most direct crossing of their right-of-way. He noted that Herdal crosses directly and has limited grading in the right-of-way. Planner Murray commented that Alternative 4 is skewed to the south, so it doesn't cross the right-of-way directly, and that a considerable amount of fill is placed in the right-of-way. In regards to Alternative 5, he observed that, while this alternative crosses the rail line more directly, more roadway is located in the UPRR right-of-way. Based on these issues, we don't know what UPRR's position would be for Alternative 4 or 5.

Commissioner Spokely asked if there has been any communication with UPRR for the Herdal access and the potential for Alternatives 4 or 5 in conjunction with any prior projects?

Planner Murray stated that, in regards to this project, City staff met on-site with personnel from both UPRR and the PUC (Public Utilities Commission). He indicated that staff presented UPRR with preliminary plans showing the Herdal crossing to solicit their input, and that UPRR responded that they were okay with the Herdal crossing location and asked that the bridge span increase from 60' to 70' when the application is submitted. Planner Murray then addressed prior projects and crossing locations, noting that in the late '70's an application was made by the

City for three crossing locations, including one at Bloomer, one at Pacific Street, and one location between the two. He indicated that Southern Pacific responded to the request, authorizing only the Bloomer crossing. Planner Murray commented that the approval expired after 2-3 years.

Planner Graham added that the Bloomer crossing was above grade, while the two other crossings were at-grade. She also noted that the response did not indicate why the two other crossings were not approved, but that presumably it was because the crossings were at-grade.

Planner Murray reiterated that the response to the City's application did not include reasons why the other two locations were not selected.

Commissioner Spokely commented that the roadway profiles were helpful. He also reviewed the color-coded access alternatives map and noted that several areas have roads with slopes up to 15%. Commissioner Spokely asked for confirmation that the grade of Auburn Folsom Road from Indian Hill Road down to the Vintage Oaks subdivision was 6%-7%.

Planner Murray responded that that was the case.

Commissioner Spokely expressed concern regarding recent incidents on Auburn Folsom Road south of Indian Hill Road, and that the grade of the new roads would be over twice the grade on Auburn Folsom Road. He noted that this is an important distinction to make given the extreme slope of the new alternatives. Commissioner Spokely also observed that the downgrade on Indian Hill Road was also 6%-7%.

Commissioner Spokely requested confirmation regarding the staff report information which indicated that Alternative 4 would impact 14 acres in association with the roads, grading, and slopes.

Planner Murray noted that a total of 14 acres would be impacted, including 1 acre in the UPRR right-of-way and 13 acres in wooded natural terrain.

Commissioner Spokely asked if these impacts would be in addition to the impacts for the Herdal extension, based on the City Attorney's comments earlier about the applicant's access rights on Herdal.

Planner Murray commented that, based on the City Attorney's earlier statement, these would be additional impacts.

Chair Snyder noted that the 15% road grade is very steep and asked what mitigation could be provided to prevent freezing on the street, otherwise vehicles wouldn't be able to negotiate the road.

Director Wong commented that these designs have the maximum slopes with the minimum impacts. Staff didn't want to go further with the designs, as all the

impacts would stay the same. You could mitigate the slopes by making them less steep and with wider road radii for curves, but that would result in a longer road, taking more area, buying more right-of-way, and impacting more land and trees. Director Wong noted that the alternatives represent the minimum impacts. He stated that it would be unlikely that the City would let a road of this length be built with a 15% grade given the access needs for police and fire and the potential for adverse weather conditions. Director Wong concluded by stating that if the exercise were continued, all the points in the staff report stay the same and things would just get worse, resulting in more impacts to land, vegetation, and property owners.

Chair Snyder opened the public hearing and asked the applicant to come forward.

Stephen Des Jardins, applicant, addressed the Commission as follows:

I appreciate all the hard work that's been done by the team on this, we've looked at this in great detail. So, without repeating all the points, there are a few that really stand out for me. Number one, there is a brief discussion on our access rights. We agree that we have those access rights, and we would certainly exercise those. So now, we then go from there to the question is, would the City ever want to prosecute eminent domain for a second road that does not meet the need once Herdal is in place, and those thresholds and those tests for something that, again, we have all the traffic studies that show that our plan, as proposed, works from the City's standards. Being that's the case, to try to say we need this other road even though the studies show it works, wouldn't seem very sensible from that standpoint.

To go one step further, this other map that has all the colors on it, we've also shown the roads on there and one of the things that you'll notice is there aren't any roads in the red zone, because that's the very steep slope area. We worked very hard for a slope policy to stay out of the 20% slopes, so oddly enough, this proposal would put roads in 30% plus slopes. And even as you would struggle to try to take property from the Sipes and Shackner to go on flatter slopes, as Will was discussing, you couldn't ever get there at the other end, on the lower left hand part of the map, because you have that tight radius going to the railroad. So you just really couldn't get there; there's a reason why bridges are built at some point; you just can't get there from a road standpoint. Obviously, the Foresthill Bridge is a good example of that; try going down that road down the canyon.

The other part about this that's really striking, this is not a police station or a fire station where the City would be pursuing eminent domain, it would be taking land from a generational ownership family. I just can't imagine that would ever be a thoughtful idea, especially if Herdal would still be built and exist anyway. For me, that's kind of my beginning and end; the access exists at Herdal, so why would there be eminent domain at another location?

Then I go in to the notion that we are very passionate about the size of the preserve that is maintained in Baltimore Ravine, and when we look at the aerials, it wasn't a hard conversation to have. This is the most heavily wooded part of the site. The

number of trees that would be destroyed in that area, that 14 acres, or as you pointed out maybe 13 acres, would be the highest impact of any part of the project, for something that is not needed because you have the Herdal access. So, why would you do the highest impact? And then, you bifurcate the open space, have drainage issues, have all these things we took great pains to avoid. We just would never have proposed that, we think that would be a very, very bad idea.

It is actually a good exercise. Obviously, a great deal of work has been done by the design team and your City staff, who has done an excellent job. It's interesting to see how you keep coming back to the previous decisions that were made by the PUC that Reg mentioned earlier, or even if you look at the old historical photos and you see the flume that was built over Bloomer Cut for the mining district. It's about the same location as the bridge; there's a ridgeline there, there's a reason why these roads are where they are, and the topo dictates that. As well as the forward planning, that in 1965, George J Herdal put this access in place for Herdal for the site that we enjoy now.

So, there's a lot of thought to that, went in to by the property owners, the Planning Commissions, the City Councils, the City Engineers that signed the maps for Vista del Valle 1 that shows that access, for Vista del Valle 4 that shows requiring that access, so we've been at this for quite some time. I think that we've run the gamut on this exercise and I think it's a help to reaffirm not only the planning that's been done this round on Baltimore Ravine, but the previous rounds that looked at many years ago and made that decades ago.

Chair Snyder thanked the applicant and asked if anyone else wanted to comment on the access issues before the Commission.

Kristy Steen, 3456 Apollo Circle, Roseville, identified herself as the youngest daughter of Leslie Sipe and read a letter from her mother to the Commission. The letter expressed her mother's opposition to the taking of her family's legacy property, when there has been an access in place via Herdal since the 1960's. Ms. Steen also expressed her own view that eminent domain should not happen, as there is no necessity to go to Baltimore Ravine via Pacific Street with the Herdal Drive access already in place. She also noted that the Sipe family "will not go quietly into the night".

Andy Helms, 11080 Oakview Terrace, commented on access to public areas. He stated that he's fine with access via Herdal for Plan Area 1, but is concerned about the size of Plan Area 2 and impacts to access by that phase. Mr. Helms expressed concern that Werner Road is not sufficient for secondary access and that more than one access should be provided, such as Pacific Street.

Marjie Koltun, 11117 Oakview Terrace, stated that she doesn't like the project and doesn't like that Herdal is provided as the only access or as the construction access. Ms. Koltun stated that she doesn't believe that the road alternatives are valid because the City wouldn't approve a road that is as steep as those shown on the



plans, and that there are better ways to go into the project without steep grades. Ms. Koltun also commented that Auburn has a number of steep roads. She stated that the safety information presented by the City was over-exaggerated. Ms. Koltun indicated her agreement with Mr. Helm's statement that another access should be provided in addition to Herdal. She commented that Herdal affects a number of people and the new road location would only bother the Sipes. While she's sympathetic to the Sipe family, she stated that they have benefitted over the years by selling off parts of their property.

Jim Dahlin, 490 Rogers Lane, stated that the road with Alternatives 4 and 5 would be too steep and too dangerous, and a less steep option should be provided.

Chair Snyder closed the public hearing.

Chair Snyder opened the public hearing and asked the applicant to come forward.

Stephen Des Jardins responded to comments raised by the public as follows:

- Noted that the project, as proposed, is served by three access points, not one;
- Clarified that Werner Road does not go through a subway. The road people are thinking of is Perry Ranch Road, which only serves as emergency access;
- The top of the bridge would be 50'-60' above the Sipe homes, which would make it visible to other homes in the area as well.
- Offered to tour the project with the public.

Chair Snyder closed the public hearing and brought the item to the Commission for discussion.

Commissioner Spokely noted that Alternative 5 would introduce a new traffic signal on Auburn Folsom Road and asked about the City's standard for spacing between signals.

Planner Murray commented that the Alternative 5 signal would be 750' south of Pacific Street, which is the same distance that exists between the Maidu and Herdal signals on Auburn Folsom Road.

City Engineer Warren stated that there is no hard and fast rule, but that for an arterial like Auburn Folsom Road, you like to keep traffic moving and a half-mile separation is a good goal; anything under 750' would not be good.

Commissioner Spokely requested that staff review the access for Plan Area 1 as proposed for the Project.

Planner Murray summarized the Project access, with primary access provided by the extension of Herdal. The Herdal Werner Connector would provide primary through access for the entire plan. The Herdal extension would be necessary for the first

five model homes. For units 6-75, the Herdal Werner Connector can be completed, or more likely, Rogers Lane would be extended and improved from Werner Road to Street D, a new road that's extended from Plan Area 1. A third point of connection would also be provided with Perry Ranch Road, which is only an emergency access.

Commissioner Spokely noted a prior comment about a road with a subway and asked which road had the subway.

Planner Murray stated that Perry Ranch Road is the existing road with the subway under the eastbound UPRR line.

Commissioner Spokely observed that even with Plan Area 1, the Project has a minimum of two points of access for the 270 units, and the project has an emergency access road as well.

Director Wong noted that the emergency access is not gated.

Commissioner Spokely stated that he had no more questions and asked if it was time for deliberations.

Chair Snyder indicated that it was time for deliberations.

Commissioner Spokely stated the following:

I appreciate the opportunity to look more focused at these additional alternatives, 4 and 5, that the City Council has seen fit to kind of put back to us. In going through the very detailed report that the applicant and staff put together, it becomes even more clear to me that these are highly complicated, highly unlikely, highly costly, albeit for me personally, cost wasn't really part of my contemplation on these access points. What I look at was, the geometrics, the slopes, the configuration of the roadways. I understand the point that was made by staff, by Public Works I believe, that this represents kind of the best that possibly could be from an environmental impact, from a footprint standpoint that could be achieved. In all likelihood, if Alternatives 4 or 5 were decided upon and direction that was required for the project, we are probably looking at more significant impacts, not only environmentally, but property rights - the Sipe family, the ARD property, the like.

For me, a big consideration is the visual aesthetic for the people driving through our community and in looking at a fairly substantial span of the railroad, significant fill slopes, fill slopes based on what I've seen in some of the graphics presented that are akin to interchanges, as you drive up and down Highway 80. We are all familiar with the large fill slopes that are created to get us over major roadways. Those fill slopes are, at least in my professional opinion, are of the magnitude we see, 20', 30', 40' in elevation to get across the railroad. It just creates a very, and in my opinion, undesirable aesthetic driving into and out of Auburn, our town.

The other pretty significant concern of mine is, while we are trying to lessen the impact of property owners who have purchased property and maybe not fully

understanding that there is a public right-of-way cutting through their back yard, the reality is, the property owner has rights. The original owner of the property created those rights for a reason, the City obliged and created rights of way and access easements to preserve those rights, and my concern is what liability might be created for the City if we try to impede that right at this juncture. Obviously, that's not a decision for us to make in this body, but it would certainly be a concern that I would hope would be acknowledged by the City Council as they contemplate whatever decisions that we make here tonight.

Again, I appreciate the detailed nature of the report prepared by staff, by the developer and the consultant team. I'm going to struggle with a motion to recommend either of these alternatives based on what I've seen. From my perspective, the lesser evil of the two is probably Alternative 4, just based on looking at emergency response times, impacts, not necessarily impacts, but emergency response times and other considerations. But, again, its clear to me that, based on existing rights, based on potential liability the City might incur, that Herdal access seems to be the most appropriate access for this project.

Chair Snyder stated the following:

I've reached many of the same conclusions for the same reasons. I, too, think Four, when you only look at Four or Five, Four is just marginally superior, but superior is the wrong word to attach to it because of the complications with safety, disturbance of natural resources, legal difficulties; you mentioned visual intrusion that doesn't exist today. Cost is a factor to me, because I've always looked at the Baltimore Ravine project as the possibility for a variety of housing that would attract young families to Auburn, and it's important how much the housing costs. It's important to me to have a diverse housing base in Auburn and Baltimore Ravine was a way to preserve that diversity, so cost is a consideration.

Chair Snyder asked for a motion for the two questions.

Commissioner Spokely began a motion involving Alternatives 4, 5, and Herdal; however, Chair Snyder noted that the first motion should address only Alternatives 4 and 5.

Commissioner Spokely retracted his initial motion and made the following motion:

I move, that upon review and comparison of Alternatives 4 and 5, the Auburn Planning Commission recommends Alternative 4 to the Auburn City Council, with the explanation that the Planning Commission finds both alternatives unacceptable for the following reasons: (1) The negative impacts to emergency response times; (2) Exposure of the public and safety personnel to unsafe situations associated with: a) the length of the roadway in dense vegetated areas; b) Steep cuts and fill slopes; c) Steep road grades; and d) Increased criminal activity due to greater access to remote areas; (3) The City does not have existing dedicated rights-of-way for either of these two

alternatives; (4) Eminent domain would be required to secure the required rights-of-way since private property owners have indicated, quite clearly, that they would not be willing sellers; and (5) The use of eminent domain would expose the City to potential legal liabilities.

Chair Snyder seconded the motion. The Planning Commission voted 2-0 to approve the recommendation.

Chair Snyder made the following motion regarding the comparison of Alternative 4, Alternative 5, and Herdal:

I move that the Planning Commission recommend to the City Council that when the three accesses are considered, Herdal is clearly superior for many of the same reasons you mentioned. I'm just going to summarize mine: safety issues, disturbance of natural resources, legal difficulties, visual aesthetics. So, we recommend that Herdal be the approved access to the project, from the Planning Commission.

Commissioner Spokely seconded the motion. The Planning Commission voted 2-0 to approve the recommendation.

**B. ANNUAL PLANNING COMMISSION PRIORITIES LIST DISCUSSION.**

Continued to next meeting

**C. ANNUAL HOUSING ELEMENT REPORT.**

Continued to next meeting

**D. ANNUAL GENERAL PLAN IMPLEMENTATION WORK PLAN AND CHECKLIST REPORT.**

Continued to next meeting

**E. ANNUAL LAND USE PLANS AND IMPLEMENTATION WITH SACOG BLUEPRINT COMPARISON.**

Continued to next meeting

**IV. COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT FOLLOW-UP REPORTS**

**A. City Council Meetings**

Director Wong informed the Commission that the BRSP Project will be returning to the City Council on Monday, February 28, 2011.

**B. Future Planning Commission Meetings**

Director Wong noted that the next Commission hearing date is March 1, 2011.

- C. Reports  
None

**V. PLANNING COMMISSION REPORTS**

The purpose of these reports is to provide a forum for Planning Commissioners to bring forth their own ideas to the Commission. No decisions are to be made on these issues. If a Commissioner would like formal action on any of these discussed items, it will be placed on a future Commission agenda.

None

**VI. FUTURE PLANNING COMMISSION AGENDA ITEMS**

Planning Commissioners will discuss and agree on items and/or projects to be placed on future Commission agendas for the purpose of updating the Commission on the progress of items and/or projects.

None

**VII. ADJOURNMENT**

The meeting adjourned at 7:38 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Reg Murray